

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 are present in this application. Claims 1 and 7 are independent claims.

**Request for Listing of Cited References**

As previously mentioned, newly cited references of Davis, U.S. Application Publication 2002/0001395, and of Tsang, U.S. Patent 6,510,002, have not been listed in a Form PTO-892. **Applicant requests that a Form PTO-892 be prepared that lists the newly cited references.**

**§ 103(a) Rejection – Davis, Parulski**

Claims 1-3, 5, and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Application Publication 2002/0001395 (Davis) and U.S. Application Publication 2003/0058354 (Parulski), and further in view of U.S. Application Publication 2003/0063186 (Tomono; newly cited). Applicant has amended claim 1. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based on the claims as amended.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis, Parulski, Tomono, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,965,413 (Wada). At least because of the dependency of claim 4 on claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 4 is patentable for the reasons provided for claim 1.

In the last filed amendment, the Applicant had previously argued that Davis does not disclose a display section that displays an image for stereoscopic view. Applicant had intended that “stereoscopic view” encompasses use of an image for the left eye and an image for the right eye.

In response, the Office Action provides a newly cited reference of Tomono that discloses a convertible 2D/3D display device.

In particular, Tomono discloses a 3D display based on the integral photography (IP) method, that uses a lens unit of an electro-optic material in which the refractive index can be

selectively adjusted (Tomono at para. [0011]). Adjustment of the refractive index enables switching between a 2d video mode and a 3D video mode. Fig. 3 shows an orientation of the liquid crystal layer 34 for 3D mode. 2D mode is accomplished without filtering in the lens unit (para. [0032]).

Tomono further discloses that the imaging display that provides an image for the lens unit can be a cathode ray tube CRT, a liquid crystal display LCD, a plasma display, or an electric luminescence EL display. (para. [0013]). Thus, it can be seen that Tomono discloses a lens unit for use in combination with a 2D display device.

Subsequently, Applicant submits that, although Tomono discloses a three dimensional image, Tomono does not use image data for a left eye and image data for a right eye to generate the three dimensional stereoscopic view. Instead, Tomono discloses a display device that is provided in conjunction with a conventional two-dimensional display. The display image and the underlying image data are two dimensional image data.

The present invention provides a less complicated display device than the device disclosed in Tomono. In order to clarify this difference over Davis and Tomono, Applicant has amended claim 1 to explicitly recite that stereoscopic view utilizes image data for left eye and image data for right eye, respectively.

Applicant submits that neither Davis nor Tomono disclose a display device that can produce a stereoscopic view based on image data for the left eye and image data for the right eye.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Davis, Parulski, and Tomono, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose at least the claimed display section. Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**§ 103(a) Rejection – Davis, Parulski, Tsang**

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis, Tomono, and Parulski, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,510,002 (Tsang). Applicant has amended claim 7. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based on the claim as amended.

Claim 7 has also been amended to explicitly recite that stereoscopic view utilizes image data for left eye and image data for right eye, respectively. For the reasons above for claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 7 is patentable over Davis, Tomono and Parulski.

Furthermore, as previously argued, Applicant submits that Tsang fails to disclose the claimed “controller.” The claimed “controller” generates three dimensional image data in the case that the image data to be displayed by the display section represents a two dimensional image. Applicant invites the Examiner to review information about the Pulfrich effect that is used in Tsang, such as described in WIKIPEDIA.

In particular, Tsang discloses an adapter that may be placed in front of a television screen or computer monitor (i.e., an extension of the television display) to enable three-dimensional images to be perceived by a viewer. Tsang does not disclose generation of three dimensional data to be displayed by the television display. Instead, the adapter includes a liquid crystal polarizer in which the polarization angle is varied by varying an applied voltage. Tsang’s adapter operates based on the “Pulfrich effect” (col. 2, lines 24-26). The Pulfrich effect produces a display based on the same image data with different signal strength level for each of left and right eyes. The different signal strength causes a psychophysical illusion in the visual cortex of the brain of an image in three dimensions. The procedure is shown in Figs. 6-8 and 10-12, in which the different signal strength is generated from a single set of image data provided for a conventional television.

The section in Tsang at column 3, line 45 to column 4, line 36, which is relied on by the Examiner, discloses image data provided as different video signal levels, as it states that left eye and right eye see “same video signals which have different signal level.”

Applicant submits that it can be seen that Tsang does not teach the claimed controller for the case that the image data to be displayed represents a two dimensional image, for generating three dimensional data, and much less teach generation of two sets of image data for each of left and right eyes. Thus, Tsang fails to disclose at least the claimed controller capable of generating three dimensional image data from the image data representing a two dimensional image, as recited in claim 7.

At least for these reasons, Applicant submits that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness. Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert Downs** Reg. No. 48,222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 26, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Downs #48222  
Charles Gorenstein Robert Downs  
Registration No.: 29,271  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant